

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 MARIO MENDOZA,  
11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 SAN LUIS AUTO GLASS, INC.; JOSE  
14 BERNAL ARELLANO, AS TRUSTEE  
15 OF THE JOSE BERNAL ARELLANO  
16 AND MARTHA ELIZABETH  
DOES 1 to 10,

17 Defendants.

No. 2:25-cv-06580-JAK (MAAx)

**ORDER RE TO SHOW CAUSE RE:  
SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION  
OVER STATE-LAW CLAIMS**

18  
19 Based on a review of the Complaint (Dkt. 1), the following determinations are  
20 made:

21 The Complaint alleges violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42  
22 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.* (the “ADA”), the Unruh Civil Rights Act (the “Unruh Act”), Cal.  
23 Civ. Code §§ 51–55, and other provisions of California law. Dkt. 1 ¶¶ 18–45.  
24 Supplemental jurisdiction is the basis for the state-law claims. Dkt. 1 ¶ 7.

25 District courts may exercise “supplemental jurisdiction over all other claims that  
26 are so related to claims in the action within such original jurisdiction that they form part  
27

1 of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.” 28  
2 U.S.C. § 1367(a). This “is a doctrine of discretion, not of plaintiff’s right.” *United Mine*  
3 *Workers v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715, 726 (1966). “In order to decide whether to exercise  
4 jurisdiction over pendent state law claims, a district court should consider . . . at every  
5 stage of the litigation, the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and  
6 comity.” *Nishimoto v. Federman-Bachrach & Assocs.*, 903 F.2d 709, 715 (9th Cir. 1990)  
7 (citation omitted).

8 In 2012, California imposed heightened pleading requirements for Unruh Act  
9 claims. Cal. Civ. Code § 55.52(a)(1); Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 425.50(a). In 2015,  
10 California also imposed a “high-frequency litigant fee” for plaintiffs and law firms that  
11 have brought large numbers of construction-related accessibility claims. Cal. Gov’t Code  
12 70616.5. As detailed in previous orders by this Court and other district courts in  
13 California, these reforms addressed the small number of plaintiffs and counsel who bring  
14 a significant percentage of construction-related accessibility claims. *E.g.*, *Whitaker v.*  
15 *RCP Belmont Shore LLC*, No. LA CV19-09561 JAK (JEMx), 2020 WL 3800449, at \*6–  
16 8 (Mar. 30, 2020); *Garibay v. Rodriguez*, No. 2:18-cv-09187-PA (AFMx), 2019 WL  
17 5204294, at \*1–6 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 27, 2019). These statutes impose special requirements  
18 for construction-related accessibility claims brought by high-frequency plaintiffs  
19 pursuant to the Unruh Act. Because accepting supplemental jurisdiction over such claims  
20 would permit high-frequency plaintiffs to side-step those state-law requirements by  
21 pursuing the claims in a federal forum, many district courts, including this one, have  
22 declined to exercise such jurisdiction. *E.g.*, *Whitaker*, 2020 WL 3800449, at \*6–8;  
23 *Garibay*, 2019 WL 5204294, at \*1–6.

24 A review of the docket in this District shows that, in the one-year period preceding  
25 the filing of the Complaint, Plaintiff has filed more than ten actions in which he has  
26 advanced construction-related accessibility claims. In a California Superior Court,  
27 Plaintiff would be deemed a high-frequency litigant. Therefore, “California’s recent  
28

1 legislative enactments confirm that the state has a substantial interest in this case.” *Perri*  
2 *v. Thrifty Payless*, No. 2:19-CV-07829-CJC (SKx), 2019 WL 7882068, at \*2 (C.D. Cal.  
3 Oct. 8, 2019).

4 In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff is **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** why the  
5 Court should not decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims.  
6 Plaintiff shall file a response to this Order to Show Cause, not to exceed ten pages, on or  
7 before August 11, 2025. In responding to this Order to Show Cause, Plaintiff shall  
8 identify the amount of statutory damages Plaintiff seeks to recover. Plaintiff shall also  
9 present a declaration, signed under penalty of perjury, providing the evidence necessary  
10 for the Court to determine if Plaintiff meets the definition of a “high-frequency litigant”  
11 as defined in Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 425.50(b)(1) & (2). Failure to file a timely response  
12 to this Order to Show Cause may result in the dismissal of the state-law claims without  
13 prejudice by declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over them, pursuant to 28  
14 U.S.C. § 1367(c). Defendant may also file a response to this Order to Show Cause, not to  
15 exceed ten pages, on or before August 18, 2025. Upon receipt of the response(s), the  
16 matter will be taken under submission, and a written order will issue.

17  
18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19  
20  
21 Dated: July 31, 2025



22 John A. Kronstadt  
23 United States District Judge  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28